

1946

Mike Mansfield - Speech for Re-election

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Mike Mansfield - Speech for Re-election" (1946). *Mike Mansfield Speeches*. 20.
https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/20

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

1-9468 7
MY FELLOW - MONTANANS

This is Mike Mansfield speakin'. As you know I am a candidate for reelection to the Congress of the United States. I have tried to serve you to the best of my ability for the past six years and I am campaigning on my record and my service to you because that is what I should be judged by.

My opponent, Judge Angstman, who has over two years to serve on the State Supreme Court to which you elected him four years ago for a six year term, has made certain criticism of my record. The word "JUDGE" which he uses on all occasion is defined as one who is impartial, just and fair in his findings. It is my purpose to answer ~~him~~ his criticism because there are two sides to every question and I think you are entitled to know the truth.

My opponent states that I am opposed to a reduction in government expenditures and criticizes me for voting against tax reduction. No one that I know of is against economy in government. That is only common sense. Wherever possible the cost of government should be cut. But, since of every tax dollar 70¢ goes for military purposes, including paying for the cost of World Wars I and II, it is evident that not too much can be saved even if the greatest economy is practised.

The Judge asserts that the tax bill passed by the 80th Congress was not a rich man's bill. Lets ask the American housewife?

The housewife knows that the tax bill passed by the Congress meant very little to her family and she knows that it was not only a rich man's bill but highly inflationary as well. She knows that the bill increased the take home pay for those with an income of \$3,000.00 by only 3.2%; for those with an income of \$25,000 by 18.5%; and with those of an income of \$250,000 by 58.4%. She knows that the high cost of living has more ~~been~~ wiped out the pittance which she may have received. She knows ——— ~~and so do you Judge~~ ——— that the only real income tax

House of Representatives
Congress of the United States

1ST DISTRICT MONTANA
MIKE MANSFIELD

FOREIGN RELATIONS
COMMITTEE

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

D. C. Mansfield

measure -- the Mansfield bill H.R. 4882, which I introduced only after Congress refused to pass an anti-inflation program. This bill would have exempted single persons up to \$1,000; married couples to \$2,500 with \$500 for each dependent and it would have given relief to all people equally -- regardless of income. It has not been given a hearing by the Republican controlled Ways & Means Committee -- WHY? Because it would have given relief to those who needed it most-- the low income groups-- and only the same relief to those who needed it the least and who could best afford to pay.

The housewife knows that because of the passage of this tax bill another bill increasing taxes may have to be introduced in the next Congress. Chairman Knuteon of the Ways & Means Committee, even admitted this and his statement to that effect is in the Congressional Record on the day the tax bill passed. How do you think they will go about getting increased revenue? Let me tell you what I think will happen. In my opinion, a bill to impose a sales tax will be introduced. I base this statement on the fact that the Republicans tried this last summer to force through the Congress a sales tax to pay for the cost of the government of the District of Columbia. I led the fight against the sales tax in the House last June; I tried to get a roll call vote on the measure but could not and the bill passed the House but was stymied in the Senate. As a result, the government employees of the District of Columbia did not get a raise in salary this year but all other government employees outside the District did. You draw your own conclusion from this.

The housewife knows too, that it was the Republican majority in Congress which imposed the 20% excise tax on cosmetics, baby powder and other necessary articles and services. This tax should be repealed because it affects the low

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

J. E. Mansfield

-3-

income groups, the small businessmen and because it is in ^{reality} ~~really~~ nothing more than a sale tax. My opponent states that he will reduced taxes more. How? The U.S. News for October 22, reports a possible deficit of three billion dollars next year. Do you favor a sales tax?

Yes, Judge, you know all this when you made your statements on my vote on the tax bill. Why didn't you tell the people the whole truth? Why didn't you tell them that Charles Skouras, the ~~movie~~ ^{movie} magnate, received a tax cut of \$64,000 a year; and that William Randolph Hearst, had his take home pay increased by \$34,000 a year and why didn't you tell the people that 40% of the five billion tax reduction will will be a windfall for only 5% of the American taxpayers in the higher brackets? And yet you had the gall to say that this Republican tax bill is not "a rich man's measure."

My opponent criticizes me for receiving the same salary that all other U.S. Congressmen receive and brings up the fact that a Congressman received a \$2500. expense account and mileage to Washington. Why didn't you tell the people the truth, Judge? You know and the people of Montana know that I voted against giving Congressmen an expense account and against raising our salaries because I felt we should set an example to the rest of the country and do what we could for the people before we did anything for ourselves.

Let me quote from page "A" 2401 of the Congressional Record for May 11, 1945, when this matter was brought up: "Mr Mansfield of Montana. Mr. Speaker I feel that the portion of H. R 3109 having to do with allowing \$2500.00 to Members of Congress for expenses is ill-advised at this time. It is not so much a question of need-- as that is very apparent -- but it is a matter of holding the line against inflation. This line is not being too strongly held at this time and I am fearful that this

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, D. C.

particular legislation may open the flood-gates to wide-spread demands for wage increases and thus bring about an inflationary situation which we might not be able to control. On that basis I was one of 124 who voted against the rule reporting H.R. 3109 to the House, was one of those who voted to recommend the bill to the Appropriations Committee, and then, when that failed of passage, was one of 83 who voted against final passage of the measure."

Why didn't you tell the people that? Judge, you find fault with my vote on the Federal Employees Loyalty bill, but you neglect to give the people the truth. There is no argument but that our national safety demands that all employees of the Federal government not loyal to the United States should be removed at once. However, H.R. 3813 as passed by the House of Representatives on July 15, 1947—but not even reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee — was a dangerous bill. It had a fine title— which you have bandied about in all your talks— but it lacked all the elements of a decent respect for democratic rights and the standards of fair play. As a Judge, why didn't you tell the people what was in this proposal?

It was dangerous because the system it would set up for eliminating the ^{provides} disloyal/wholly inadequate protection for loyal employees who might be unjustly accused.

Under this bill a five member loyalty board would be both prosecutor , judge and jury. The votes of three members would be sufficient to dismiss any employee from the federal service. The accused person would have no opportunity to face or cross-examine his accuser. The Board would be required to conceal from him the source of the information against him. He would have no right to appeal from the Board's decision— no recourse in any court or other tribunal.

The bill would make it possible for innocent government workers to be ruined

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

-5-

on information planted by Communists or other subversives.

Under this bill there would be no trial; no review. The Board would operate under a star chamber procedure, which should be repugnant to every one of us.

And, Judge, even though only 61 Congressmen voted against this bill and 319 voted for it I was glad to be associated with such outstanding Republicans, as Keen, N. Y. Cole, N.Y., Hale, Maine; Heselton, Ohio; Miller, Connecticut, and others of that party who voted with me against this measure.

Judge, would you with 16 years on the Supreme Court of this state vote for such a bill? Would you place the lives and careers of innocent people at the mercy of a Board whose decision would be final? Would you deny the right of any one accused to cross-examine, to be represented by counsel, to appeal to the courts of this country? Would you approve a bill— like this one, which does not give the accused the right to face his accuser— to see the evidence? Don't you believe that Congress should be the first line of defense in the guardianship of the people. As a judge, who is supposed to be impartial, just and fair and to protect the rights of all citizens — what is your answer to these questions?

Then my opponent you criticize me for undertaking a highly confidential mission to China for President Roosevelt in 1944 — during my first term, — for voting against appropriations for the Rankin-Thomas Committee — for not being on a certain committee which he said I should have stayed on in the interests of Montana.

Judge, would you have refused a direct request of the President of the U.S. to undertake a mission to an ally during war time? Of course you would'nt nor

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

D. A. Mansfield

-6-

would any self respecting American and yet you find fault with me for doing my duty, Being selected by the President was not so much an honor to me as it was to our fine state educational institutions where I was trained.

My opponent states I voted against appropriations for the Rankin-Thomas Committee. I did and I'll tell you why just as I did two years ago. I have no apologies FOR Ifelt that the work that would require this appropriation/ could be more effectively and efficiently done by our F.B.I. and certainly I don't have any excuses for the F.B.I

I believe also that all angles of Un-Americanism should be investigated and that includes Communism, Fascism and the Ku Klux Klan.

Personally I have absolutely no use for an American Communist or a fellow traveller because I am satisfied with our system and I feel strongly that those who are in favor of any foreign idiology should be investigated and that laws should be passed to curb them once and for all. My stand and my support of legislation covering this is a matter of public record for all to see.

In the matter of the Committees you have reference to you know -- and all Montana knows that I left the Foreign Affairs Committee on Jim O'Connors death in 1945 and held on to his committee until a Congressman was elected from the other district. Then these committee assignments were turned over to him and I went back to my original assignment on Foreign Affairs. Why, I even went to Joe Martin and asked that he place my colleague on these Committees

Judge you said at Hamilton on October 18, that sending me back to Congress would make it harder to get things done for Montana. Why don't you tell the people of my successful fight to save Flathead Lake, of my authorization bill for Hungry Horse, of my fight for the past five years -- including this year-- against the most terrific opposition to get appropriations for the Hungry Horse and the transmission line -- and

I got them. Why don't you tell the people who played the major part in getting the Air Base at Great Falls retained and enlarged; who got an authorization act and a \$750,000 appropriation for a Montana Indian wing to the T.B. hospital at Galen; and who — when the choice of a Veteran's Hospital was between western North Dakota and Eastern Montana — got it for Montana. Why don't you tell the miners and smelters of Butte and Anaconda who fought against the permanent lifting of the ⁴⁴ a lb. excise tax on copper? Why don't you tell the people that Mike Mansfield got \$21,000,000 for his district in Reclamation, Irrigation and Power funds this fiscal year whereas the whole state of Montana received only 24 million. Why don't you ask the REA's who has been fighting for them all down the years? Why don't you tell the people that when anyone from Montana wrote or asked me for assistance that I did everything in my power to help them. Let me ask you a fair question, Judge? Can you name one project Montana should have gotten during my six years in Washington that she did not receive? Can you name one instance where I have knowingly fallen down on my job as a representative of the people?

My opponent is trying to fool the people with half-truths and falsehoods. This is not a way for a judge— fair, impartial and just — to act. There are issues we can disagree on but I believe that when we discuss them we should hold fast to the truth. My opponent should'nt condemn bureaucrats as he does because he has been a bureaucrat during most of his residence in our state, 16 years a judge, other year's serving in the Attorney-General's office and the Railroad Commission—tell the people about those days, Judge— all add up to a long time during which your salary has been paid by the State of the United States

My opponent, in Sunday's Montana Standard, and under a Missoula dateline, tries to tie in with Marcantino of New York. Judge, you know and the people of Montana

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, D. C.

-3-

know that I do my own voting and that no individual, organization or corporation ever tells me how to vote -- and never will. Just what do you mean by your innuendoes Judge? Just whom are you trying to fool? Don't you know that the decent self respecting people whom I represent are the only people I am responsible to. Personally, I think you have hit a new low in campaigning against me, but I am glad that the people of Montana, as a result, are finally getting to know you for what you really are.

Judge, the people know where I stand on every issue because my votes are recorded in black and white in the Congressional Record. Why don't you come down out of the clouds -- or should I say up out of the mud -- and tell the folks where you stand, specifically, on such questions as public power, housing, Taft-Hartley Act, Tidelands oil, UMT., the high cost of living, the Mundt-Nixon bill and our foreign policy.

During my six years in Congress I have cast over 1200 votes. Taking my opponents 6 handpicked criticisms of my voting record - which I assume is the maximum number of black marks he has against me-- in view of the character of his attacks on me -- taking those 6 in a total of over 1200 recorded votes during my time in Congress, would show by his own standards, I failed to vote as he would have in only 1/2 of 1% of my votes, and that he approves my voting record 99.5%.

I would say that was fairly good, for as I remember during my school days, anything over 90% was marked A and anything over 95% was marked A plus.

And, let me say that while my record is not perfect it is my record and my responsibility -- and mine alone.

I am campaigning on my record as the servant of the people I represent. I would

like now to report on what I think the people should know in addition to what I've already said. Time will not allow me to finish this evening but I'll take up where ~~ix~~ I leave off next Monday nite at 9 o'clock.

Judge, in your newspaper ad and li/terature you say you believe in lower living costs. What do you propose to do about this matter? You have not uttered one word of criticism about the Republican party's record in the 80th Congress of doing nothing about inflation except to encourage it. What program do you propose. Montana's people would like some details.

You say you are for removing Communists from the Federal payrolls. So am I. Would you vote for the ~~limit~~-Nixon bill to do this and to make it a crime for anyone to advocate the overthrow of our government by force or to advocate the establishment of a totalitarian form of government here. I did. Would you?

You say you are for more housing. So am I. I've tried to do something about it but your Republican majority in the House and Senate failed to give heed to this problem. Yes, they talked about housing for veteran and low-income groups; they talked about housing in the \$15,000 and \$20,000 brackets — but they did nothing. Speaking of housing, you know that I got more veteran's housing units for M.S.U and M.S.C., than was allocated to any other schools of comparable size in the U.S. You know, also, that I fought for low rents on these projects and if you don't want to believe me, ask the G.I's who live in these units about it.

You know, Judge, that I served as an enlisted G.I in the Army, Navy and Marines.

~~Washington, D.C.~~
House of Representatives
Congress of the United States

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, D. C.

-10-

and you know that I have done all in my power to be their champion at all times. I have not bestowed boquets on the G.I's in time of war, only to forget them when the shooting is over. No, my record in their behalf speaks for itself and the G.I's know it.

My opponent says he is for an increase in Social Security benefits. As a Judge and a Republican does he approve of the action of the Republican majority in overturning ^a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court and passing legislation taking 750,000 people off the Social Security rolls. I certainly do not and my vote against the removal proves it. How do you really stand on this question Judge?

Friends, my time is drawing to a close. I want the people of Montana to know that I have pursued a course as your Congressman that has been dictated by the deepest convictions and when a man fails to follow his sincere conviction, no matter how unpleasant the consequences, he is false to himself, false to the people he represents and false to his country.

THIS IS MIKE MANSFIELD - AMERICAN - saying Good Evening until next Monday night at 9 o'clock over these same stations.